

Attorney Docket: 112.P14061

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 30-57 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. In this response, claims 30, 40 and 50 have been amended, and no claims have been added or cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C §103(a)

In the Final Office Action, dated January 3, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 30-57 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's admitted prior art" (hereinafter, AAPA) in combination with Vent (U.S. Patent No. 5,489,457). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

AAPA v. Vent

Failure of references to teach all the limitations

Although Assignee does not agree with the Examiner's characterization of Vent or what Applicant has admitted as prior art, it is respectfully submitted that AAPA, whether viewed alone or in combination with Vent, does not contain all of the elements of the pending claims, as amended, and, therefore, do not render the pending claims obvious. For example, none of AAPA or Vent teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, and the Examiner has made no showing that all of the claim limitations are present in these cited references, either expressly or inherently.

Failure to teach reflection planes, reflective plating films

As just an example, neither AAPA nor Vent teach or suggest "a plurality of reflection planes formed on at least a portion of the plurality of inside walls, and one or more reflective plating films directly coated on at least a portion of the plurality of reflection planes", as recited in claim 30, as amended. According to the Examiner, on page 2-3 of the Office Action, "Applicant's admitted prior art optical chassis comprises a shell body (141) having an accommodation space defining a plurality of inside walls; a plurality of reflection elements (mirrors 143) formed on at least a portion of the plurality

of inside walls." However, The Examiner has mischaracterized this portion of the specification. For example, quoting from "Description of the Prior Art", beginning on page 1, line 12 of the specification, "As the prior optical chassis 14 shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, because the silver plated on the glass pieces constructs the reflection mirrors 143, it is necessary to fix the mirrors on the predetermined positions inside the shell body 141 by spring pieces 146, fixture devices or in accordance with screw fixtures." There is no description throughout this section of the specification that any reflection planes are formed on at least a portion of the plurality of inside walls, or, further, that reflective plating films are directly coated on at least a portion of the plurality of reflection planes. This portion of the specification clearly describes the mounting of mirrors on the chassis via spring pieces, fixture devices or screw fixtures, and does not teach or suggest reflection planes, or plating films directly coated on reflection planes. Therefore, AAPA fails to teach or suggest numerous elements of claim 30, as amended.

Additionally, Vent does not cure any of the multiple deficiencies noted above. Vent is directed toward a chrome film having an adhesive layer, which may allow the reflective tape to be adhered to a surface. Quoting from col 4:28 – col 4:31, "In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the adhesive layer 25 it utilized to adhere the reflective tape to the opposing reflector surface". Vent does not teach or suggest reflective plating films directly coated on at least a portion of the plurality of reflection planes. Vent shows a reflective tape that may be adhered to a reflector surface. The reflective plating film is not directly coated the reflector surface, but, rather, the reflective film is formed on an adhesive layer, which may then be applied to a surface in an additional formation step. Vent does not teach or suggest reflection planes, or plating films directly coated on reflection planes, and, therefore, fails to cure the deficiencies noted above.

Therefore, any resultant combination of Vent with AAPA, if successful, although Assignee does not accept that a successful combination of Vent with AAPA could be made, would still not result in the formation of reflective plating films directly coated on at least a portion of the plurality of reflection planes to reflect light, but, rather, would simply appear to result in the formation of an optical chassis with reflective tape adhered to one or more surfaces. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the combination of Vent with AAPA, if successful, would still fail to provide all the elements of the rejected claims. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make a successful showing of obviousness.

Attorney Docket: 112.P14061

Conclusion - Claims are not Obvious

Assignee respectfully submits that because a sufficient showing of obviousness has not been established, claims 30-57, as amended, are in a condition for allowance. It is noted that many other bases for traversing the rejection could be provided, but Assignee believes that this ground is sufficient. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the Examiner enter the amendments to the claims, and allow these claims to proceed to allowance.

Attorney Docket: 112.P14061

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner enter these amendments so that the application may proceed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3703.

Dated: _____

5/3/06

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Willardson
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 50,856

Customer No. 43831

Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLC
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006
503-439-6500